

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7 and 12-14 are amended. Support for the amendments is found, for example, at pages 24 and 34-35 of the specification.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Sain in the August 24 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 are amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Burkett (U.S. Patent No. 6,635,089) in view of Sato (U.S. Patent No. 6,013,680); rejects claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Burkett in view of admitted prior art (APA) and further in view of Sato; and rejects claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Burkett, APA and Sato, and further in view of Chau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,633). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither Burkett nor APA, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests a document processing synthesizing means for synthesizing a document processing rule string based only on the rule embedded in the structured document, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7, 13 and 14.

The Office Action, at page 4, asserts that Sato discloses the above-noted features of the claims. As discussed during the August 24 personal interview, Sato discloses a method of

converting a non-structured document into a structured document. See Abstract of Sato. As such, Sato does not disclose or suggest a structured document processing system for processing a structured document. However, even if Sato were to be combined with Burkett and APA, the combination does not disclose or suggest the above features of the claims.

As discussed during the personal interview, Sato, in Fig. 1., discloses a keyword extraction module 102 that extracts keywords from non-structured document 101 to generate a keyword/text model 104. The keyword/text model 104 is used to generate a structured document that matches a document structure definition DTD (document type definition). The DTD conforms to the rules stipulated in ISO (international organization for standardization). See, for example, col. 6, lines 44-57 and col. 7, line 38 - col. 9, line 59. In other words, the keywords extracted from a document are not rules per se, but are used to match with a DTD that can be used to generate a structured document. On the contrary, the claims recite that the rules are embedded in the documents and a document synthesizing means synthesizes a document processing rule string based only on the rule embedded in the structured document. Therefore, the combination of Burkett, APA and Sato does not render obvious the above-noted features of independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 14.

Furthermore, for the reasons discussed above, none of the applied references disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 12.

Chau does not compensate for the deficiencies of Burkett, APA and Sato.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7 and 12-14 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-6 and 8-11 depend from the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter as well as for the other features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/mdw

Date: August 29, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--